



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the line we are supposed to be reciting verse, and the quantities if unstressed are absolutely identical. What is the difference, then, between the two readings? The old metric says the stress; what does the "new-old metric" say?

Extremes meet, and the relentless consistency of Professor White's uncompromising logic brings him nearer to me in many ways than to his supposed allies, some of whom, as Professor Murray certainly (cf. the *Atlantic* for November), and probably Professors Wilamowitz and Schroeder, read Greek poetry with a rhythmic stress, while others in America claim to be able to read it with a prose stress, or none at all. This divergence is more significant than any concurrence in paper schemes of tetrasyllabic scansion or in the weight attributed to the authority of Hephæstion and his kind. Professor White admits (p. xxii) that we cannot read Aeolic verse in any other manner than what for brevity I will call the logæœdic and dactylo-epitrite way. He adds, "The resolution to read them, even at the cost of reading them in the wrong fashion, is prompted no doubt by a generous impulse." I infer that he is superior to that generous weakness and would not read them at all. My own "unscientific" interest in the question ends there. If neither I nor my classes are to hear Greek poetic rhythms, there are many other subjects, organic chemistry, for example, which I should prefer to study and teach. $\text{HO}_2\text{C}.\text{CCI}:\text{CH}.\text{CCI}_2.\text{CO}.\text{CHCl}_2$: is quite as interesting as, and I am told vastly more practical than, $\text{cr}+\text{en}+3\text{tr}+\text{glBb}+\text{x}+\text{c}$.

But even so, I am curious to know the precise force of the complaint that the "assimilation of Greek meters to English and the neglect of the differences obscure the individual charm of each language." Just how would Professor White and his students enjoy the distinctive individual charm of Greek meters if they neither hear nor recite them? Have they refined their aesthetic perceptions to the point where "heard melodies are *wrong*, but those unheard are sweeter"? Professor White says that "only a highly imaginative mind can grasp the idea of reading dochmiac verse." But the enjoyment of its "individual charm" without hearing it seems to me a still higher flight of the auditory imagination.

PAUL SHOREY

Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft, unter Mitwirkung von J. BELOCH, E. BETHE, E. BICKEL, J. L. HEIBERG, B. KEIL, E. KORNEIMANN, P. KRETSCHMER, C. F. LEHMANN-HAUPT, K. J. NEUMANN, E. PERNICE, P. WENDLAND, S. WIDE, F. WINTER; herausgegeben von ALFRED GERCKE und EDUARD NORDEN. Erste und Zweite Auflagen 1910-12. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

To Gercke has perhaps fallen the most thankless task—that of writing the chapter on *Methodik* that was to have been done by the master hand of Usener. Of the difficulty of his task he is well aware, but although his

presentation lacks somewhat in clearness and conciseness, he has on the whole furnished the beginner with a very good introduction to the study of philology.

The first chapter (pp. 3-26), "Das antike Buch," begins with a short but very satisfactory sketch of the history of philology. One is glad to observe that the Banquo's ghost of paleography, "cotton paper," that reappeared in the first edition (p. 10), has been banished from the second. In the discussion of the "national scripts" (p. 16) a reference to the important part played by the Insular script on the continent might well have been added. The situation in regard to the bibliography of catalogues of manuscripts is not so desperate as Gercke represents (p. 17). For Latin manuscripts we have Weinberger's excellent *Catalogus catalogorum* (Wien, 1902) and his *Erstes Supplement*, covering the literature down to 1907. Weinberger might also have been mentioned *honoris causa* for his *Jahresberichte und Abhandlungen*.

The second chapter (pp. 27-32), "Die wissenschaftliche Methodik," will be of little immediate use to the beginner; it has therefore very properly been reduced to fine print in the revised edition.

In a brief chapter on "Die Einheit der philologisch-historischen Methode" (pp. 33-36) Gercke maintains the parity of philology with history, against the claims of many historians who would make her the handmaid of historical investigation.

Chap. iv (pp. 36-80), "Formale Philologie," is the most important and the most helpful for the beginner. In this and the following chapter the whole range of problems likely to occur in a proseminar is thoroughly covered, with an abundance of illustrative material. The topics covered are: (1) the search for manuscripts, their collation, the establishment of relationships, the construction of a stemma with its attendant difficulties and dangers, contaminated and interpolated manuscripts, the use of scholia, commentaries, citations, translations, paraphrases, etc.; (2) the recensio; (3) interpretation of the text; (4) discovery and correction of corrupt passages; (5) higher criticism; and finally (6) esthetic interpretation, with a warning as to its dangers and the abuse of it. Instead of citing examples from a wide range of literature to illustrate the various possibilities that may arise—and as far as covering the ground is concerned Gercke has done his work well—would it not have been more profitable to make use, in part at least, of model investigations of such masters as Haupt or Mommsen, in order to illustrate their method of handling the various phases of a philological problem, showing how the proof progresses from stage to stage? Further illustrative material might have been cited without going into particulars. But even here it would seem advisable to use texts with which the beginner is more familiar than he is likely to be with Seneca's *Naturales quaestiones* or Diogenes Laertius. In any case the bibliographical reference should always be given; this is not done for Strobel's study of the manuscripts of Cicero's *De oratore* (p. 40).

Chap. v (pp. 80-94), "Sachliche Philologie und Geschichte," is written along lines parallel as far as possible with the treatment of chap. iv. The illustrative material is well chosen, though almost entirely from the Greek.

Chap. vi (pp. 94-112), dealing with "Sprachwissenschaft," and chap. vii (pp. 112-124), dealing with "Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte," will serve as excellent introductions to these subjects. Gereke closes his work by repeating a much-needed warning that one cannot learn palaeography and archaeology by reading about these subjects, nor the language and literature from reading handbooks.

An "Anhang," "Das Studium der Philologie und Geschichte in seiner propädeutischen Bedeutung für den zukünftigen Lehrer" (pp. 124-27), has special reference to conditions in Germany, but it can be read with profit by every young philologist.

CHARLES H. BEESON

The problem offered by the two classical literatures in this series must have been difficult to solve. The student already has the stimulating general treatment by Wilamowitz and Leo in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, and the dry statement of essential facts in the volumes of Müller's *Handbuch*. The three editors have properly endeavored to effect a compromise, with varying degrees of success. Greek poetry of the ante-classical and the classical periods is divided under rubrics describing the types; the poetry of the Hellenistic and the Roman periods is not similarly treated, obviously because later developments led to greater versatility on the part of individual poets; but, whatever the rubric, the treatment of the subject is essentially chronological in order and, apart from brief introductory paragraphs in which are resumed the characteristics of the type, the individual poets are in the foreground. Similarly in Norden's account of Latin literature, although the author finds his problem in the development and adaptation of Greek types by the Romans, the treatment is by periods and individuals with a subdivision into prose and verse in each period. This method, conventional and serviceable as it doubtless is, robs these two sketches of any special distinction unless the treatment itself rises above the commonplace. Any brief sketch of Greek poetry must repeat much that has been as well or better said by others; in this case I feel that the student may perhaps better derive the facts of biography, authenticity, and the like from his Christ-Schmid and then soar with Wilamowitz. The sketch of Latin literature has a stronger claim, in so far as the author's special interests have led to needed emphasis upon style, but on the other hand Norden has not succeeded so well as his collaborators in the difficult art of elimination: an introductory conspectus does not call for constant reference to chapter and verse, to dates, and to details of meter and rhythm, but rather for safe generalizations that will orient the student and broaden his horizon; as it is, the reading is difficult because of close condensation, and

assimilation is even more difficult because of the author's failure to discriminate what is essential for the student in need of orientation from what is of absorbing interest to the author and other scholars. Let me hasten to add that from a scholarly standpoint Norden's sketch represents much greater special effort, to all appearances, than any other portion, and it should be said that those who have got far beyond the doctorate cannot afford to miss the mass of stylistic comment that is gathered here by the author of *Die antike Kunstprosa*.

Wendland's account of Greek prose (but not his account of Christian literature in Latin, which perhaps necessarily deals with individual authors in chronological order) in my opinion best satisfies the needs of the student for whom the work is intended. On the surface it shows little indication of effort, but without becoming fully eidographic in method, the author succeeds in giving the individual due prominence in the midst of broad generalizations about the γένος, or illuminating suggestions of cultural values. Such rubrics as "Philosophie und Diatribe," "Skepsis und Romanistik," "Neuplatonismus," "Der Roman," represent to me the groupings that the student needs in a work of this character. Of course it may be said that Wendland's field, especially in the later centuries, leads naturally to treatment by types and to the neglect of relatively insignificant individuals, but it is not merely this mechanical feature that I have in mind; rather, it is the author's inevitable breadth of vision, his sense of perspective, his appreciation of large historical relations. Needless to say, there are defects arising from the method; if Theophrastus is treated under the rubric "Hellenistic Rhetoric," his *Characters* must be either omitted or intruded; in this case there is a rather unfortunate omission.

The most admirable feature of the two sketches is the appendix on "Gesichtspunkte und Probleme" added to the history of each of the literatures. This in itself makes the work absolutely indispensable. I doubt if there could be a better statement of the sources and materials, and, more particularly, a more intelligent estimate of available problems for the prospective worker in the history of literature. It is gratifying to note, both in these appendices and in the body of the work, the constant emphasis upon the form of literary types and upon style in the narrower sense, and in the appendix to the section on Greek literature it is especially welcome to find a recognition of the value to classical students of the work, in technique and in literary history, of Behagel, Bédier, Thimme, and others who have already helped to solve corresponding problems in modern literature. The constant criticism of the uninitiated that the classical field offers no opportunities because it has been worked for so many centuries may well be met by a reference to these inspiring accounts of what remains to be done, especially in technique; Heinze's program in the *Neue Jahrbücher* of 1907 may be realized if the student is persuaded by the practical suggestions of Bethe, Wendland, and Norden.

H. W. P.

The section on Language is from the competent hand of Professor Kretschmer of Vienna, who has succeeded in giving, in scarcely more than a hundred pages, an astonishingly comprehensive survey of the subject, packed with pertinent and trustworthy information. He does not attempt to furnish a comparative grammar of Greek and Latin, of which only the barest skeleton would be possible in the allotted space. But, believing that the first need of classical students is an acquaintance with the principles and methods of modern linguistic science, he devotes over fifty pages to the treatment of certain general principles of linguistic development, with application to and illustration from the classical languages. Thus under the head of "Lautlehre" is given, not a systematic phonology of Greek and Latin, but a discussion with illustrations, of such topics as the physiology of sounds, pronunciation, relation of spelling to speech, the question of the invariability of phonetic laws, various classes of phonetic change, etc. Special attention may be directed to a new and important point of view, which the author had already developed incidentally in an article in the first volume of *Glotta* and presents here under the head of "Wertabstufung der einzelnen Konsonanten nach ihrer Stellung im Wort" (pp. 490 ff.). It is based on the observation of certain well-known facts, such as the frequent preservation of sounds initially when the same sounds are lost or changed in other positions (e.g., ς in many Greek dialects, or f in Latin), and the particular weakness of sounds when final (e.g., Latin m , or loss of most final mutes in Greek), from all of which is deduced a sort of sliding scale, measured by a given sound's resistance to change or its positive effect on a preceding sound, as follows: (1) initial of the word, (2) initial of the syllable, (3) final of the syllable, (4) final of the word. Thus the author explains the much-discussed contrast between $\kappa\alpha\rho\ \rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\nu$ from $\kappa\alpha\tau\ \rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\nu$, with assimilation of τ to ρ , and $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\nu$, etc., without such, as due to the stronger assimilating force of the initial ρ . Whether the predominance of regressive over progressive assimilation in most consonant groups is to be viewed in the same light, that is, attributed to the fact that the sound beginning the syllable is stronger than that which ends the preceding (see the above scale), may appear more doubtful. For it may reflect the relative dominance of the anticipatory tendency, regardless of the "strength" of the second element. Certainly the regressive distant assimilation as in Sanskrit $\varsigma\upsilon\alpha\varsigma\upsilon\tau\alpha-$ from $*\varsigma\upsilon\alpha\varsigma\upsilon\tau\alpha-$ points to this factor and not to the "scale of strength," which in such cases would lead to the opposite result, namely progressive assimilation as in Sanskrit $\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\iota\eta-$ from $*\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\iota\eta-$.

The same method—discussion of general principles with illustration—is employed in the chapters on inflection, word-formation, semantic change, and syntax. The author's thorough acquaintance with Modern Greek enables him to introduce many significant illustrations from this field.

Under the head of "Sprachgeschichtliche Gesichtspunkte und Probleme" is given an excellent survey of the languages and dialects of Greece and

Italy; the classification of the Greek dialects, their rôle in literature, the source of the *κουνή*, and similarly, though more briefly, the linguistic conditions in Italy. The paragraphs on the Macedonian and Etruscan questions will be read with especial interest, since the author is one who has studied most intensively the problems of the minor languages of the ancient world.

C. D. BUCK

Regarded as a compendium of the facts of prosody, meter, and metrical terminology, Dr. Ernst Bickel's *Antike Metrik* is an admirable piece of condensation. For what readers is it intended? The American student, I am sure, could not understand it. Is it possible that the German can? If so, he has made rapid progress in the last few years. In the second edition, the chapter on "Liedbildung" has been greatly enlarged by the consideration of the theories of Wilamowitz, Blass, Schroeder, Leo, and others with regard to glyconics, dactylo-epitrites, enoplics, etc. The standpoint of the new *Metrik* is taken for granted, and there is hardly a hint of the serious objections that have been raised against it. It is presumed that "science" has decided; the "cyclic dactyl" is treated as something on which no more words need be wasted. Quadrisyllabic scansion is assumed, and the historic evolution of Greek meters from some indeterminate, prehistoric form is regarded as proved. This fashion may prevail for a few years. But as these things are not, and cannot be proved, the time will come when the case will have to be reopened, and a hearing granted to the counter-arguments. Scholars will not always accept as proof the fact that we may, if we please, rearrange groups of one, two, or three syllables in groups of four, three, and five, on the authority of late Greek scholiasts. Dr. Bickel finds confirmation of quadrisyllabic scansion in a comparison of the ending of the scazon with the three or four cases of initial choriamb in iambic trimeter that occur in Greek drama. That may pass on paper. But to the ear there is not the remotest connection between the two things. The scazon, as the name choliambus implies, is plainly a comic variation of the iambic trimeter. It is an auditory joke *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*.

Der Hinkiambus ist ein Vers für Kunstrichter,
Die immerfort voll Naseweisheit mitsprechen,
Und eins nur wissen sollten dass sie nichts wissen.

Dr. Bickel chooses to affirm that it is a survival of the original quadrisyllabic structure, but he does not offer the slightest proof. The initial choriamb in such lines as *Ἰππομέδοντος σχῆμα καὶ μέγας τύπος* is a rare exception in Greek tragedy. It is familiar enough to English readers in Shelley's "Fills the faint eyes | with falling tears which dim," or in Tennyson's "Ask me no more, | the moon may draw the sea." It does not sound in the least like the conclusion of a scazon. The only resemblance is

that both have four syllables. This virtual identification of --- with --- is possible for Professor John Williams White, who has the courage of his logic, and affirms that Greek poetry has no rhythmical stress, and that since we cannot read it so, we should not read it at all; cf. *supra*, p. 104. But Dr. Bickel, like most European advocates of the new *Metrik*, believes in an expiratory rhythmic accent, and the antispast, therefore, for him is and must be something more than the mere quantities of its four syllables, rearrangeable at pleasure. It is idle to deprecate this appeal to the ear, or to the modern rhythmical sense. The modern rhythmical sense is the only one we know. In the loss of the music we have no test but this, and the indications of word-endings, and the natural phrase groups. This last is the proper field for investigation, but the new metricians decline the challenge. How many of them have read Pindar aloud, *both* by Schroeder's and Schmidt's schemes? This is the first step in any fruitful comparison. And the second is to determine, not in arbitrarily selected passages but throughout, which way of reading imposes least or most violence on the natural flow of the Greek phrase. Even this is partly subjective. For opinions may differ as to normal and natural Greek phrasing, nor do we know how far the habit of setting poetry to music may have reconciled the Greek ear to the distortion of normal utterance in recitation. But unsatisfactory as it is, it is the only test that we have. We cannot accept mere affirmation that Hephaestion must have known, or unverifiable deductions from the original Indo-European meters. Homer and Archilochus stand between us and that.

PAUL SHOREY

The treatment of *Private Life*, by Pernice, is brief but good. After a chapter devoted to a general consideration of the character of the subject-matter and the nature of the sources, the discussion is divided into three parts, dealing respectively with: I, "The House," II, "Dress," and III, "Marriage, Birth, and Death." Each of these parts is subdivided into a Greek and Roman section. Those who are familiar with Marquardt's work will be struck at once by Pernice's strict interpretation of the term *Privatleben*. He protests against the practice of making books on this subject a catch-all for miscellaneous antiquities that cannot easily be classified elsewhere, referring especially to material bearing on trade, agriculture, cattle-breeding, etc. He also makes some apt suggestions on the necessity of distinguishing with greater accuracy between different periods in describing any institution, evidently having in mind the many misleading articles in handbooks, whose content is a complex of statements made by classical authors between whose lives centuries sometimes intervene. But not only distinction of time but also of place should be observed: the customs of Sparta are not always those of Athens, and the ways of the Pompeians frequently differ from those of the Romans. Pernice fully recognizes the

difficulties that confront anyone who attempts to carry these distinctions into details, but he has consistently adhered to this plan in his book, and has used his sources with wariness and discretion. In speaking of the mass of material now available through the excavations at Crete, he criticizes the tendency to use too recklessly the discoveries there in explaining the customs of the Homeric age. For the later Greek period he lays special emphasis on the importance of the excavations at Priene, of which he gives an interesting description. There is a good general account of Pompeii also; for although brief, the book is never sketchy. In regard to the early Roman period he comments on the difficulty of getting material; and a glance at the treatment of *Privatleben* in Müller's *Handbuch* (II, 2) by Voigt, who divides his account into periods, will show how true this is. In this early period, scanty as the data are, Pernice is strongly inclined to believe that the influences both from Etruria and Greece were stronger than is generally assumed. He contends that it is a mistake to suppose that the old Roman life, even the private life, was free from foreign influence.

In reconstructing the Homeric palace he is of the opinion that more assistance can be obtained from a study of the Mycenaean remains on the mainland than from those in Crete. In his discussion of the Greek house of the classical period he dissents strongly from the account given by Iv. Müller (*Handbuch*, IV, 23 f.), maintaining that the archaeological and literary evidence points to the probability that the radical differences between the Homeric and the later house, which Müller insists upon, did not exist, and that the early type of house showed in its main lines a singular persistence for centuries. In regard to the Italic house he differs also from Michaelis (*Röm. Mitt.*, XIV [1899], 210 ff.). According to the latter's view, the house, originally built in the open country, had no *compluvium*, but was lighted from windows in the *alae*; the *compluvium* was a development of the later town house, whose *alae*, on account of the congestion of buildings, could no longer give enough light. Pernice, on the other hand, thinks that the house with the *compluvium* was introduced from Etruria, the Etruscans having brought this system of building from their home in the Orient. He draws attention to the fact that the oldest atrium of this style was called the *atrium Tuscanicum*. Passing to the furniture of the Greek house, he dissents again from Müller's views (*Handbuch*, IV, 62); in regard to the couches he accepts Miss Ransome's results (*Couches and Beds of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans*.)

In the section on Homeric dress, he lays stress again on the necessity of using the Cretan monuments with the greatest caution. Cretan dress bears the same relation to that of the mainland as Cretan architecture does to that of Tiryns. In his treatment of the Roman toga he follows Amelung (*Die Gewandung der Griechen und Römer*). On account of the scarcity of early Roman sculpture he regards any reconstruction of the primitive styles of the toga and other garments as largely speculative.

In his account of marriage, birth, and death, he draws heavily on Samter (*Familienfeste*), Dieterich (*Mutter Erde*), and Marquardt (*Privatleben*), always with due acknowledgment of indebtedness. He disparages the evidence furnished by sarcophagi reliefs on marriage, not simply because none of them is earlier than the second century after Christ, but also on the ground that they are for the most part imitations of Greek works. Yet these reliefs do contain Roman elements that make them worthy of consideration.

On the whole the work is well done, showing a thorough familiarity with the literature and offering some new points of view.

G. J. LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Professor Franz Winter's review of Greek Art (Vol. II, pp. 75-166) is not, and is not intended to be, an elementary treatise. Destitute as it is of illustrations, it presupposes on the part of the reader a considerable stock of knowledge, as well as access to a well-equipped archaeological library, if not also to a museum. A reader so circumstanced will find it a stimulating guide to the main interests and problems of the subject.

After an introduction on the history of archaeological research in the Greek field (pp. 75-86), the three chief branches of Greek art—architecture, sculpture, and painting—are successively taken up. The author's skill in selecting and presenting the most significant aspects of his theme deserves the highest praise. The references also to recent literature are evidently chosen with care and judgment. Some omissions are hard to account for. Thus it is strange to find no mention under "Sculpture" of the illuminating essays of Julius Lange and Professor Löwy. Still stranger is it that Lysippus and the *apoxyomenos* should be discussed as if Professor Percy Gardner's able revolutionary article in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* for 1905 on "The Apoxyomenos of Lysippus" were non-existent. But if these are blemishes, they count for little in a work remarkable for mastery and sobriety.

In the second edition of this volume Professor Winter has made numerous small changes, substractions and additions, especially in the final pages of the chapter on "Sculpture." The suggestive essay which appeared in the first edition, setting forth resemblances between Greek art, plastic and pictorial, and Greek poetry, is now altogether omitted.

Except that the chapter on "Painting" deals with Roman wall-frescoes, there is no account in these volumes of Roman art.

F. B. TARBELL

While Wide's sketch of Roman Religion is based for the most part on Wissowa's work, it shows independence in the arrangement of the material and in the explanation of some of the cults. Wissowa traces the development of Roman religion under four heads: (1) the religion of the earliest period to the building of the Capitoline temple, (2) to the Second Punic War, (3) to

the fall of the Republic, and (4) the religion of the Empire. Wide, however, gives only two periods: (1) the pre-republican period, and (2) the republican. He restricts his sketch within these limits for the reason that, with the exception of the cult of the genius of the emperor and the worship of the emperors themselves, Roman religion showed no independent development under the Empire; it became merged in the general religious syncretism of the age, which the author has treated in his discussion of Greek religion in the preceding section of this volume.

In his general characterization of Roman religion, Wide, like most other writers on the subject, comments on the relative unimportance of its nature-cults as compared with those of Greece. That this element is less definite, less clear-cut in Roman religion than in Greek is true. But too much emphasis is laid upon the point. Among the swarms of spirits with which the early Romans peopled their world, many were identified with processes of nature, e.g., the spirits connected with the growth of the seed.

In his discussion of the *Sondergötter* the author points out that the occurrence of feminine names (*Runcina* beside *Subruncinator*, *Messia* beside *Messor*) is probably to be referred to the fact that women also worked in the fields. In the case of *Seia*, *Proserpina*, and *Flora*, however, the sex of the divinity is in all likelihood due to the idea of productivity. That the worship of some of the *Sondergötter* persisted among the common people later than the literary records would seem to indicate, is shown by survivals in the Christian worship of the saints.

Wide disagrees with Wissowa's theory of the *Lares*, reverting to the old view that the *Lar familiaris* was the ancestral spirit of the family. He explains the *Lares compitales* as a later development of the cult. He doubts also the soundness of the view held by some writers that there was a reaction in favor of the old Roman gods after the Second Punic War, drawing attention to the fact that even when new temples were built to Roman gods in that period, the cults of these gods had been hellenized. In his account of the festivals he exposes the futility of always seeking some one god as the original divinity, in whose honor the festival was held; in some cases the festival is older than the god, e.g., the *Lupercalia*. He dwells with some emphasis on the importance of Augustus' reforms. For although this reformation, from the fact that Roman religion was a state institution, was in a sense only part of the Emperor's plan of setting his political house in order, yet it did make a strong appeal to those in whose lives religion still had a place, and these included large numbers, not only among the common people, but also in the educated classes.

G. J. LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Professor Gercke's hundred-page outline of the history of ancient philosophy answers very well its presumable purpose of orienting the beginner in

the recent German literature and philology of the subject. As a literary exposition of ancient thought it cannot compare with the brilliant sketch of von Arnim in *Kultur der Gegenwart*, which, it is true, is nearly twice as long. Only a commanding philosophical talent could give a helpful, critical interpretation of the pre-Socratics, Plato, Aristotle and the post-Aristotelian schools in the space at Gercke's disposal. We may then take his remarks on philosophy proper as *obiter dicta*, and I will not delay to controvert his assertion that the *Gorgias* recalls a concession made in the *Phaedrus*, that in *Republic* 331A and 386 ff., Plato had "not yet" discovered the immortality of the soul, that the *Republic* is a congeries of studies dating from different periods, and that while in *Republic* 437A and *Protagoras* 332A Plato is "not yet" aware of the distinction between contrary and contradictory opposition, he has come to recognize it in *Republic* 491D and in the *Symposium* and *Sophist* (cf. my review of Apelt's *Aufsätze*, *supra*, VII, p. 489. Gercke accepts without question the tradition that Polyxenos first "discovered" the argument of the "third man," which is clearly stated in the tenth book of the *Republic*. The condemnation of Homer in the *Republic* and the paradoxical defense of lying in the *Hippias* are for him illustrations of Platonic "sophistry." The last he associates with the designation of rhetoric as a kind of deception in the *Phaedrus*. We could as well pronounce Tolstoi a sophist for condemning Shakespeare, Ruskin a sophist for emphasizing the historical opposition between Puritanic morality and the most highly developed art, or Schopenhauer and Renan sophists for telling us, what is the plain truth, that nearly all rhetoric and literary art is the creation of an illusion.

Gercke dismisses the method of *Sprach-statistik* in an ironical paragraph. He also, I am pleased to see, rejects the Platonic *Epistles*, which he says have misled even distinguished historians. The problems which he chiefly recommends to the young investigator are *Quellenuntersuchung* and "restoration" of lost works. He has no misgivings as to the enormous amount of things which are not so or not proved with which this type of inquiry is encumbering the literature of the subject. He shares the professional philologist's naïve confidence in the power of "method" to extract the truth from insufficient evidence. For example, he recommends the young investigator to determine by close analysis the imperfect transitions and obtrusions of alien matter in the Platonic dialogues that will enable him to detect the way in which heterogeneous compositions of different dates were pieced together. In other words, the actual logic of composition and the association of ideas in great writers is to be superseded by the ideal of the logic of literary composition of those who have never composed anything. A sentence from the introduction of Jowett's *Republic* is the best antidote to this excess of method. "Nor need anything be excluded from the plan of a great work to which the mind is naturally led by the association of ideas and which does not interfere with the general purpose."

Gercke illustrates in the concrete the problems and methods of investigation in this field by a useful appendix on the history and present status of the Platonic question. To this he adds in the second edition a similar history of the Cicero-question, with a convenient summary of the conclusions thus far supposed to have been proved as to the sources of each of Cicero's philosophical works.

Professor Johann Ludwig Heiberg presents in sixteen pages an excellent sketch of the development of mathematics and the exact sciences from the Ionians to Galen. Especially helpful is the second section on literature and bibliography, which, however, strangely omits to mention Dreyer's *Planetary Systems*, Adam's *Platonic Number*, and Beare's *Greek Theories of Elementary Cognition*. Under the third heading, "Problems," Heiberg treats indistinguishably both of the problems out of which Greek mathematics actually arose, and the problems which still await investigation by the student of Greek science. Among the latter he singles out the date of Heron, the predecessors of Copernicus, the history of oppositions in geography, the identification of plants and animals mentioned by classical writers, and the critical sifting and study of the Hippocratic Corpus. The number in *Republic* 586BC, and the problem of *Meno* 86E-87A he thinks still await a satisfactory solution.

PAUL SHOREY

Vol. III contains "Griechische und römische Geschichte" and "Griechische und römische Staatsaltertümer." Greek history to the battle of Chaeronea is done by Lehmann-Haupt. On the whole the work is well done. Particularly praiseworthy are the sections on colonies, and on the development of Athens. The least successful sections are those on the *Vorzeit*. The relation between the Trojan culture, and the Cretan and Mycenaean is far from clear.

In general the emphasis is upon external politics, commercial development, and military activities. The author avoids the mistake of over-emphasizing the importance of commercial factors in determining policies. Athenian jealousy of Corinth's commercial control in the West is assigned as the cause of the Peloponnesian War; but no comment is made on the reason for Athenian interference in Sicily. The author's view on some disputed points may be noted. The mutilation of the *Hermae* is ascribed to Corinthian instigation. He accepts Nicole's reading of the Geneva papyrus ascribed to Apollodorus, according to which the Eleans paid 40 talents to Athens for the release of Phidias from custody in order that he might make the statue of Zeus. In the main Aristotle's account of the revolution of the Four Hundred is accepted. The unfinished state of Thucydides' work explains discrepancies. He ascribes the authorship of

the *Oxyrhynchus Hellenica* to Cratippus; and accepts the view that the Boeotian federal senate was quadripartite.

The selection of Beloch to treat Greek history from Alexander to Augustus, and Roman history to the end of the republic is to be commended. No man is better fitted for the task. Not the least important of his qualifications is his vigorous and lucid style. The separate treatment of this period of Greek history is amply justified. In no other way can the history of the Roman conquest of the East be satisfactorily presented. Strangely enough Beloch fails to mention Alexander's conquest of Egypt. Neither does he mention the political importance of the declaration of the oracle that Alexander was the son of Ammon (cf. Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 302).

The important rôle of federal unions in Greece is duly emphasized. The history of the western Greeks and the expedition of Pyrrhus are passed over in silence. The explanation doubtless lies in the fact that these matters are fully dealt with in connection with the history of Rome. Similarly the reader is referred to the previous account of Greek history for details of the Roman conquest of the East. One feels however that succinct summaries might profitably have been introduced. Only a few matters of detail can be mentioned. The theory of an Etruscan conquest of Rome is rejected. The change from monarchy to republic is regarded as an evolution. The influence of Greece upon Rome is constantly emphasized. He points out that if Hannibal had been victorious the result would have been the independence of Magna Graecia rather than Phoenician domination in the West. The common view that the Italian confederacy of 90 B.C. was a counterpart of the Roman system is not accepted. He likens the new confederacy to a Greek *κοινόν*, and remarks that it was "der gerade Gegensatz zu der verrotteten Verfassung Roms." Leading statesmen are seldom characterized. Sulla's services in conquering Greece and in establishing Italian unity by overthrowing the confederacy are recognized, but he is described as "eine der unheilvollsten Erscheinungen der Weltgeschichte." Of Caesar he remarks, "Ihm war jedes Mittel recht, das ihn zur Macht führen konnte; und so trug er kein Bedenken, sich mit der Anarchistenpartei zu verbinden." This is doubtless true, though there is no evidence to connect Caesar with Catiline. Of Cicero he has nothing to say beyond giving him full credit for suppressing the conspiracy of Catiline.

Kornemann writes the history of imperial Rome to the middle of the seventh century. He presents in relatively few pages a broad synoptic view of the history of the empire, pausing at important periods to go into details, e.g., the reign of Hadrian. Attention is constantly called to manifestations of the influence of "Germanum."

Keil's *Griechische Alterthümer* is very largely concerned with origins and developments. Evidence from various communities and different periods is assembled in the effort to present a composite picture. The classification of the senate of 500 as an *ἀρχή* brings out very clearly its relation

to the *ecclesia* which is treated as a development of the aristocratic *ἐκκληται*. The persistently reactionary character of the Areopagus, recruited as it was from ex-magistrates of a democracy, is not explained. The discussion of *Rechtspflege* is in general good except in the case of the monarchy. The relation between a royal or a noble arbitrator and a magistrate with judicial functions is not obvious enough to be passed over in silence. The trial scene pictured on the shield of Achilles is not a *Mordprocess*. Omissions were inevitable, and are not to be criticized, but one may wonder why ostracism and the significance of election by lot are ignored.

To each section are appended excellent chapters on sources, chronology, and problems. This plan frees the text from elaborate and distracting notes and offers much that is of interest to the specialist.

R. J. B.

Terence. By J. SARGEANT. Text and translation on opposite pages. The Loeb Classical Library. New York: MacMillan. Two vols. Pp. xiii+351 and vii+323.

In Professor Kelsey's symposium on *Latin and Greek in American Education* one of the most pleasing and significant contributions was made by a former member of one of New York's greater banking-houses. At the close of an active business career he had turned with eagerness to the enjoyment of *res dulciores et humaniores*, the elements that mean richness and fulness of life. After declaring that his experience in the workaday world of finance had only heightened his appreciation of classical influences, he announced his unquestioning belief that the study of Latin and Greek in school and college was the natural bulwark against materialistic tendencies, as well as an indispensable preparation for the higher pleasures of literature and art. His letter was enjoyed and gratefully appreciated by every lover of the humanities; and it must have had no little weight even with the profane.

But Mr. Loeb was not content to limit his services to words, although the words were welcome and helpful, and began to cast about for "some attractive and practical way" of promoting an interest in ancient literature, some "means of placing its treasure within the reach of all who care for the finer things of life." In this mood he found himself weighing a suggestion made by the well-known French savant Mr. Salomon Reinach; and after making an exhaustive investigation he decided to issue a text-and-translation series that should contain "all that is of value in Greek and Latin literature from the time of Homer to the fall of Constantinople." However, the purpose and plan of the Library is so well known to readers of this journal that I need not enlarge upon the comprehensiveness of the project or upon the laudable munificence of its founder. Whether it will achieve its lofty aim quite so directly and promptly as was hoped by Mr. Loeb and his distinguished